

# The *Catholicon Anglicum* (British Library, Add. MS. 89074): An Analysis of the Physical Evidence of its Production and Binding

James Freeman

On 27 February 2014, the British Library acquired the only known complete surviving copy of the *Catholicon Anglicum*, one of the earliest Middle English-Latin dictionaries, and thereby secured for the nation a key source for the study of English language and lexicography. The manuscript had been in the possession of the Monson family of Burton Hall, Lincolnshire, since the nineteenth century. It was sold at auction in 2013 to an overseas buyer for £92,500, but was prevented from leaving the country by the temporary deferral of an export licence by the British Government. Following a successful fundraising campaign, it was purchased by the British Library, arriving in March the following year.<sup>1</sup> Edited in 1882 by Sidney H. R. Hertridge – one-time contributor to the *Oxford English Dictionary* – but not seen publicly since, this fifteenth-century dictionary has so far been accessible solely in modern printed form. The purposes of this article are to provide the first detailed codicological analysis of Add. MS. 89074 to complement the digital facsimile now available online;<sup>2</sup> to report the findings of an examination of the manuscript prior to its digitization in April 2014, and of work undertaken since; and to shed light on the production of this important manuscript.

## I

The compilation of dictionaries and glossaries that use English to aid the understanding of Latin has a long history.<sup>3</sup> The earliest known word-lists are the Épinal (s. vii<sup>ex</sup> or s. vii/viii), Leiden (c. 800), Erfurt (s. ix<sup>1/4</sup> or s. ix<sup>2/4</sup>) and Corpus (s. ix<sup>1</sup>) glossaries.<sup>4</sup> These compilations have two key characteristics in common: the listing of Latin words or phrases in some degree

---

<sup>1</sup> Sotheby's, London: 2 July 2013, lot 55; 'Lost for words: rare UK dictionary at risk of export', Press Release, Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 17 December 2013 <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/lost-for-words-rare-uk-dictionary-at-risk-of-export>> [accessed 20 June 2015]; 'Two rare manuscripts saved for the nation', Press Release, British Library, 18 March 2014 <<http://www.bl.uk/press-releases/2014/march/two-rare-manuscripts-saved-for-the-nation>> [accessed 20 June 2015].

<sup>2</sup> <[http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Add\\_MS\\_89074](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Add_MS_89074)>.

<sup>3</sup> For further details of what follows, see Gabriele Stein, *The English Dictionary Before Cawdrey*, Lexicographia, 9 (Tübingen, 1985), pp. 8–73.

<sup>4</sup> Both the Leiden and Erfurt glossaries are, however, copies of earlier but now lost exemplars. Épinal, Bibliothèque municipale, MS. 72(2), ff. 94r-107v; Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. Q. 69, ff. 20r-36r; Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Allgemeinbibliothek, Amplonianus 2<sup>o</sup> 42, ff. 1r-37v; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS. 144, ff. 4r-64v. Bernhard Bischoff and Malcolm B. Parkes, 'Palaeographical Commentary', in *The Épinal, Erfurt, Werden and Corpus Glossaries: Épinal, Bibliothèque Municipale, 72 (2); Erfurt, Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek, Amplonianus 2<sup>o</sup> 42; Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek, Fragm. K19: Z9/1; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cgm. 187 III (e.4); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 144*, ed. by Bernhard Bischoff and others, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, 22 (Copenhagen, 1988), pp. 13–25 (pp. 16, 18–19, 25); Michael Lapidge, 'The Career of Aldhelm', *Anglo-Saxon England*, xxxvi (2007), pp. 15–69 (pp. 31, 35).

of alphabetical order (most primitively in the Leiden glossary); and the rendering in parallel of these words in either more easily understood Latin or in Old English. Subsequent examples exhibit improvements in alphabetization and layout, and the accretion of further Latin *lemmata*: for instance, a fragmentary glossary now at the British Library, which dates from the last quarter of the tenth century or first quarter of the eleventh century, and is related in its contents to the Épinal, Erfurt and Corpus glossaries.<sup>5</sup> The format and function of these tools ultimately remained the same, however: they were arranged in columns, or with *lemmata* written out continuously and separated by marks of punctuation, and served to assist in the comprehension of texts written in Latin.<sup>6</sup> The first ‘truly bilingual’ vocabularies – in which Latin words were explained solely in Old English – appeared in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and, according to Gabriele Stein, ‘furnish[ed] the Anglo-Saxon scholar and pupil with the Latin words for the common objects of life’ (rather than simply ‘explain[ing] difficult Latin words or text passages’).<sup>7</sup> The compilation of Latin-vernacular glossaries continued into the Middle English period, culminating in the emergence of the *Medulla grammaticae* in the early fifteenth century. The survival of some fourteen complete copies, four incomplete versions, and four fragments, altogether ranging in date from the beginning to the third quarter of the fifteenth century, plus six others now either lost or unidentified but recorded in contemporary documents, suggests that the *Medulla* experienced widespread and lasting dissemination.<sup>8</sup>

It was not until this time that compilers set about creating English-Latin vocabularies, spurred perhaps by the demand for ready-reference tools for the teaching of Latin composition at the nascent grammar schools. The *Catholicon Anglicum*, one such vocabulary, survives in two copies: the single complete copy, dated in a scribal colophon to 1483<sup>9</sup>; and an imperfect copy dating to the middle of the fifteenth century (British Library, Add. MS. 15562). The identity of its compiler is presently unknown. On the basis of its ‘dialectal peculiarities’, Albert Way (the editor of the *Promptorium parvulorum*) proposed that the *Catholicon* had been compiled ‘in the North-Eastern parts of England’.<sup>10</sup> This was later clarified and given some support by Herrtage – who cited specific dialect words that suggested the localization of the dictionary to ‘the north portion of the East Riding of Yorkshire’ – and it has since been widely accepted and repeated.<sup>11</sup> It would be valuable if present-day linguistic scholars could add further specificity to these nineteenth-century conclusions.

<sup>5</sup> London, British Library, Harley MS. 3376. Two detached folios from this manuscript are now Oxford, Bodleian Library, Latin Misc MS. a. 3, f. 49 and Lawrence, University of Kansas, Kenneth Spencer Research Library, Pryce P2A:1: Peter A. Stokes, *English Vernacular Minuscule from Æthelred to Cnut, circa 990-circa 1035* (Cambridge, 2014), p. 220.

<sup>6</sup> Class glossaries were also developed, in which *lemmata* were arranged by subject rather than according to the sequence of the alphabet: Stein, *The English Dictionary Before Cawdrey*, pp. 32–52.

<sup>7</sup> For example, London, British Library, Cotton MS. Cleopatra A. III. and Cotton MS. Julius A. II., ff. 120v–130v; Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS. 1828–30. Stein, *The English Dictionary Before Cawdrey*, pp. 33, 38.

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed list of surviving copies of the *Medulla grammaticae*, see Vincent P. McCarren, ‘The Gloucester Manuscript of the *Medulla Grammaticae*: An Edition’, *Journal of Medieval Latin*, x (2000), pp. 338–401 (pp. 342–45). A further extant copy is noted in Vincent P. McCarren, ‘Linguistic Problems Within the Tradition of the 15th Century Glossary *Medulla Grammaticae*’, *Bulletin Du Cange: Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, lx (2002), pp. 235–60 (p. 235). For lost or unlocated copies, see Vincent P. McCarren, ‘Bristol University MS. DM 1’, *Traditio*, xlviii (1993), pp. 173–235 (p. 224).

<sup>9</sup> Add. MS. 89074, f. 185v.

<sup>10</sup> *Promptorium Parvulorum Sive Clericorum, Lexicon Anglo-Latinum Princeps, Auctore Fratre Galfrido Grammatico Dicto...*, ed. by Albert Way, Works of the Camden Society, 89, 3 vols (London, 1865), vol. iii, p. lxxv.

<sup>11</sup> *Catholicon Anglicum, an English-Latin Wordbook, Dated 1483*, ed. by Sidney J. H. Herrtage, Early English Text Society, 75 (London, 1881), pp. xx–xxi.

The *Catholicon* is neither the earliest nor the largest late medieval English-Latin dictionary. The *Promptorium parvulorum* is commonly attributed to Geoffrey the Grammarian (fl. 1440), a Dominican friar of Bishop's Lynn (now King's Lynn).<sup>12</sup> It appeared some years earlier and contains approximately 12,000 entries to the *Catholicon*'s 8,000.<sup>13</sup> To date, seven copies of the *Promptorium* are known to survive, two imperfect and two fragmentary.<sup>14</sup> Both texts are therefore rare. However, unlike the *Catholicon*, the *Promptorium* was printed: the *Promptorium puerorum, sive Medulla grammaticae* was published in 1499 by Richard Pynson, again in 1508 by Julian Notary, and in 1511, 1512, 1516 and 1528 by Wynkyn de Worde.<sup>15</sup> Its continued republication over nearly three decades demonstrates plainly a demand for an English-Latin dictionary among fifteenth- and sixteenth-century readers. The apparent failure of the *Catholicon* to make the transition to print – to be known to the early English printers, and to be recognized as a commercial viability – suggests that the spread of the text was strictly limited, certainly in print and perhaps in manuscript too.

The textual importance of the *Catholicon* and its relevance to the history of English lexicography rests, however, upon the important advances its anonymous compiler made in the organization and structuring of its content. Unlike the *Promptorium*, whose compiler divided verbs from other parts of speech and placed each in separate alphabetical lists, the *Catholicon* is arranged entirely in alphabetical order.<sup>16</sup> A reader need not therefore know the grammatical status of a word before searching for it. Furthermore, as Gabriele Stein has recently illustrated in detail, the *Catholicon* compiler devised ways of making the content of his dictionary accessible: differentiating parts of speech with 'prelemmatic' prompts in the margin while maintaining a clear alphabetical order by capitalizing the headwords; exploiting these paratextual elements to allow for word-family organization and opening up different modes of expression in Latin to the *Catholicon*'s readers; noting orthographical variations, pronunciation,

<sup>12</sup> J. D. Burnley, 'Geoffrey the Grammarian (fl. 1440), Lexicographer and Dominican Friar', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10537>> [accessed 21 August 2015].

<sup>13</sup> Henry B. Wheatley, 'Preface', in *Catholicon Anglicum, an English-Latin Wordbook, Dated 1483*, ed. by Sidney J. H. Herrtage, Early English Text Society, 75 (London, 1881), pp. vii–xii (p. ix). For a summary of the debate concerning the attribution, see Gabriele Stein, 'The English Dictionary in the 15th Century', in *Logos Semantikos: Studia Linguistica in Honorem Eugenio Coseriu, 1921-1981*, ed. by Horst Geckeler and others, 5 vols (Madrid, 1981), vol. i, pp. 313–22 (p. 316 and n.).

<sup>14</sup> London, British Library, Add. MS. 22556 (imperfect), Add. MS. 37789 (imperfect), Harley MS. 221, Harley MS. 2274 (fragment); Cambridge, Emmanuel College, 321.7.71 (two leaves, used as pastedowns in a printed book); Cambridge, King's College, MS. 8; Winchester Cathedral, MS. 15.

<sup>15</sup> ESTC S109932 (Pynson); S112953 (Notary); S104465, S115286, S122060, S112954 (de Worde). Pynson's inclusion of the *Medulla grammaticae* in the title of his edition of the *Promptorium*, perhaps to widen the book's appeal, has resulted in the mistaken attribution of this text to Geoffrey the Grammarian: for example, see John Bale, *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum, hoc est, Angliae, Cambriae, ac Scotiae summariu[m] in quasdam centurias diuisum, cum diuersitate doctrinaru[m] atq[ue] annoru[m] recta supputatione par omnes aetates a Iapheto sanctissimi Noah filio, ad annum domini. M.D.XLVIII*. (Gippeswici in Anglia [i.e. Wesel]: Per [D. van der Straten for] Ioannem Ouerton, [1548]), f. 212. There is no evidence for this attribution in the surviving manuscripts of the *Medulla*, and the ascription is now rejected.

<sup>16</sup> Whether this made its use more straightforward for contemporaries is a moot point. Alphabetization of varying degrees of specificity had been employed in texts and indexes, particularly around the universities, since the thirteenth century, though it may not have been immediately intuitive to readers beyond those environs. However, the approach of the *Promptorium* was not necessarily more familiar: 'The separation [of verbs and other parts of speech] was quite common for fifteenth-century vocabularies', Stein has observed, though 'the compiler of the *Promptorium* was [...] the first author to use this part of speech arrangement in an English dictionary': Stein, vol. i, p. 319. For alphabetical indexes, see Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, 'Concordances et Index', in *Mise en page et mise en texte du livre manuscrit*, ed. by Henri-Jean Martin and Jean Vezin (Paris, 1990), pp. 218–28.

noun declension, verbal conjugation and syntactical construction; providing sample phrases as guides to words' application; and even composing (or recording) mnemonic verses to aid the reader's memorization; and much else besides.<sup>17</sup>

There are substantial differences between the two surviving copies of the *Catholicon*. Add. MS. 15562 is physically and textually incomplete: a leaf is missing from the beginning, another has been almost entirely excised (f. 24\*), and the final leaf survives as only a small fragment (f. 143); there are probably two more missing from the end.<sup>18</sup> The remaining contents differ markedly from those of Add. MS. 89074, with many fewer words entered up to the letter S, but more than double the number of entries as found in Add. MS. 89074 thereafter. Herrtage also noted serious textual irregularities in Add. MS. 15562, scribal errors that affected both the English and the Latin words.<sup>19</sup> Although a later production than the fragmentary copy, Add. MS. 89074 contains a purer version of the text. Either the original text remained available for reproduction or there were other textual branches descending from it – and therefore other manuscripts in circulation. The punctiliousness with which the text is laid out, written and rubricated emphasizes the care and attention that went into the production of this copy. The complete digitization of this manuscript means that the lexicographical techniques employed by the *Catholicon* compiler may now be re-evaluated in light of the visual evidence of the page, and thus advance our understanding of the extent to which format and presentation worked together to facilitate readers' use of the text.

Our knowledge of the *Catholicon*'s dissemination in manuscript in the fifteenth/sixteenth centuries is slight. An inscription at the rear of Add. MS. 89074 records its ownership in 1520 by Thomas Flower/Flowre, subchanter of Lincoln Cathedral, and probably the same person that served as Senior Proctor of the University of Oxford in 1520-21 and who had been elected fellow of Lincoln College in 1512. Flower's movements extended to Warwickshire, where he served as vicar of Salford Priors until January 1521.<sup>20</sup> Only tentative provenance evidence emerges from Add. MS. 15562. A previously unrecorded ownership inscription, written by a fifteenth-century hand, states that it was in the possession of a Nicholas Taylor. This may be the Nicholas Taylor *alias* Clyvedon recorded first as scholar of Winchester College in 1410, later as scholar of New College, Oxford in 1415 then fellow 1417-21, and fellow of Winchester College from 1421-27.<sup>21</sup> No further records of him are known. Although these records of Taylor pre-date the mid-fifteenth-century date of production for Add. MS. 15562, they are not so much earlier as to exclude him from consideration as its possible owner.

Neither manuscript yields any further evidence of ownership until the nineteenth century. Add. MS. 89074 was in the possession of William John Monson, 6th Baron Monson (b. 1796, d. 1862), who lent the manuscript to Albert Way for his edition of the *Promptorium parvulorum*, published by the Camden Society in three volumes between 1843 and 1865.<sup>22</sup> It is Monson's bookplate, or his son's, that is adhered to the front pastedown of the manuscript, and which is now numbered as folio ii. The manuscript was rebacked in the nineteenth century and bears the shelfmark 'Monson M.S.S. CLXVIII' in gilt letters at the base of the spine. A note by William John Monson, 7th

---

<sup>17</sup> Gabriele Stein, 'The *Catholicon Anglicum* (1483): A Reconsideration', *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, iii (2004), pp. 109–24.

<sup>18</sup> The collation of the manuscript is irregular, comprising quires of ten, twelve and fourteen leaves. The make-up of the final, tenth quire is uncertain. Folios 134-139 contain quire signatures i-vi, indicating a quire of twelve leaves. However, damage to the quire has resulted in the first three leaves being mounted individually; leaves 11 and 12, the counterparts of leaves 1 and 2, are now missing.

<sup>19</sup> Herrtage, p. xiv.

<sup>20</sup> *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, ed. by A.B. Emden, 3 vols (Oxford, 1959), vol. i, p. 207.

<sup>21</sup> Add MS. 15562, f. 24\*v: 'Iste liber pertinet ad Nicholaus Tayler'; Emden, vol. i, pp. 1851–52.

<sup>22</sup> Way, vol. iii, p. lxiv; Wheatley, p. viii.

Baron Monson (b. 1829, d. 1898), dated 6 December 1884, was found in the manuscript upon its acquisition by the British Library; this has been retained in its original position and is now f. 56.<sup>23</sup> Wheatley related that, when he contacted Lord Monson in 1865, the manuscript could not be found. Located soon afterwards, it was lent first to Wheatley and then to Herrtage for the purposes of editing its contents.<sup>24</sup> It disappeared from public view thereafter, passing through the Monson family by descent. Add. MS. 15562, meanwhile, was acquired by the British Museum in 1846.<sup>25</sup> This was the state of our knowledge at the time of the British Library's acquisition of the Monson copy of the *Catholicon* in February 2014.

## II

It is now possible to present additional information about how – and possibly where – Add. MS. 89074 was produced by looking carefully at its codicological make-up. The manuscript was written on paper and thus contains further data about its production, some of which may be interpreted now and some which may only make sense once the systematic study of medieval paper has been advanced. The present limitations to the study of paper – for example, the confinement of the bibliographical description of paper to a few basic details, the shortcomings of tracings as adequate reproductions of watermarks, and the difficulties involved with the technological alternatives such as beta-radiography – are well known to bibliographers and further progress in this field is eagerly awaited.<sup>26</sup> As G. Thomas Tanselle has argued, however, the development of the field depends upon bibliographers producing detailed descriptions of the paper they have studied, and thereby amassing a corpus of information whose value as a comparative resource will only grow with its size.<sup>27</sup> A pilot project, 'Mapping Medieval Paper', on the chronology, use and significance of paper as a writing support, is currently underway at the University of Cambridge.<sup>28</sup>

In the meantime, it is useful to gather what evidence we can from Add. MS. 89074: to add to the general stock of evidence currently available for the importation of paper into medieval England, where it came from and where it was available, and how it was used; also, to enhance our understanding of the method and circumstances of production of this copy of this extremely rare text. The *Catholicon* is of crucial importance for the study of the development of the practice of English lexicography as well as being a store of many otherwise unattested Middle English words. The anonymity of its compiler and the paucity of evidence as to its origins and subsequent dissemination, and the fragility of the manuscript necessitating its consultation to be strictly monitored, together demand the accumulation of as much bibliographical data as possible at present. These will furnish some tentative conclusions now and provide the basis for additional connections and discoveries in the future. This is especially the case with one crucial element of the book's structure, the parchment sewing guards, which are difficult to see at first hand and are not fully visible through the online digital surrogate.

---

<sup>23</sup> Referring to the scrap of parchment now ff. 56a-56b, the note reads: 'The Vellum of the binding in this page with the writing is of 12th century or earlier Mr Hessels informs me. The Book was at Lincoln see last page in 1520: and probably 350 years in my family.'

<sup>24</sup> Wheatley, p. viii.

<sup>25</sup> Newman's sale, Sotheby's, 12 June 1846, lot 51: Add. MS. 15562, f. ir: note by Sir Frederic Madden.

<sup>26</sup> G. Thomas Tanselle, 'The Bibliographical Description of Paper', *Studies in Bibliography*, xxiv (1971), pp. 27–67 (pp. 27–29); Allan Stevenson, *Observations on Paper as Evidence*, University of Kansas. The Annual Public Lectures on Books and Bibliography, 7 (Lawrence, 1961), pp. 11–18; Orietta Da Rold, 'Fingerprinting Paper in West Midlands Medieval Manuscripts', in *Essays in Manuscript Geography: Vernacular Manuscripts of the English West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century*, ed. by Wendy Scase, Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe, 10 (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 257–71 (pp. 257–62).

<sup>27</sup> Tanselle, p. 31.

<sup>28</sup> See <<https://www.english.cam.ac.uk/manuscriptslab/category/projects/>>.



The Monson *Catholicon* is a quarto volume, with leaves measuring around 220-225mm x 150-155mm. The original sheet size must therefore have been close to 440-450mm x 300-310mm, which approximates to the *reçute* size (450 x 315mm), one of four sizes laid down for use in the fourteenth century by Bolognese paper-makers. While the origin of the paper does not appear to be Bologna (details below), nevertheless as Philip Gaskell observed, ‘The same four sizes, more or less, were still those most commonly made in Europe during the fifteenth century.’<sup>29</sup> The fact that quire xvi (ff. 183-193) is partially uncut suggests that the book has been subject to little trimming, at least along the top edge where the paper is still folded.

Full analysis of the watermarks in Add. MS. 89074 is hampered by the format and condition of the manuscript. The quarto format means that watermarks appear horizontally and in the gutter. Those occurring across the central bifolium offer the best opportunity for reasonably accurate measurement (despite the parchment sewing guards presenting an obstacle), since the others are partly hidden behind the spine-fold. Access to the gutter is limited also by the fragility of the binding and the consequent need to restrict the opening of the book to an angle of ninety degrees or less. The impossibility of photographic reproduction and magnification of the watermarks in order to permit more accurate measurement means that very slight variations (of 1-2mm) in their dimensions cannot at this stage be employed in our analysis. A lack of facsimiles also means that we cannot compare apparently identical examples and analyse such details as sewing dots, in order to distinguish between paper formed in one mould and paper formed in its twin. In addition, any differences between the mould and felt sides of either paper stock are so slight that I cannot with confidence make such identifications and use them as the basis for further analysis in this article.

However, the bibliographical data that are available show which paper stocks were used and how the quires were assembled. The watermarks in the Monson *Catholicon* exhibit variations on the hand/glove design. At first glance, the manuscript appears to be formed of ‘discrete’ quires, each made up of only one type of paper, from two paper stocks. A change in watermark occurs at the end of quire v, after which there is no ‘doubling back’.<sup>30</sup> However, while quires vi-xvi are discrete quires formed from a single paper stock, close inspection reveals that quires i-v are mixed quires made up of two very similar paper stocks.

<i>Incidence and orientation of watermarks in the Catholicon Anglicum (Add. MS. 89074)</i>												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
i	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
		W		W	M			M	W		W	
ii	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
	W		M		W			W		M		W
iii	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
	M			M		W	W		M			M
iv	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49
	M			W	W			W	W			M
v	50	51	52	53	54	55	57 <sup>31</sup>	58	59	60	61	62
	M			M	M			M	M			M
<i>Change to a new paper stock</i>												

<sup>29</sup> Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oxford, 1972), p. 67.

<sup>30</sup> The terminology follows that used by William Emmet Coleman, *Watermarks in the Manuscripts of Boccaccio's 'Il Teseida': A Catalogue, Codicological Study and Album*, Biblioteca di Bibliografia Italiana, 149 (Florence, 1997), pp. 153-4.

<sup>31</sup> Folio 56 is the loose slip of paper containing a note by Lord Monson, dated 1884 (see above).

vi	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74
		W		W		W	W		W		W	
vii	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86
	W			W		W	W		W			W
viii	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98
	W			W		W	W		W			W
ix	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110
		W	W			W	W			W	W	
x	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122
	W		W			W	W			W		W
xi	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134
		W		W		W	W		W		W	
xii	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146
		W		W		W	W		W		W	
xiii	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158
	W			W	W			W	W			W
xiv	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170
	W			W		W	W		W			W
xv	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182
		W	W			W	W			W	W	
xvi	183	184	185	186	187----	188	189	X	190----	191	192----	193
		W		W	W				W		W	

This is demonstrated by the incidence and orientation of the watermarks, as illustrated by the table above. Watermarks positioned with the thumb above the hand/glove are represented by ‘W’; those with the thumb below by ‘M’. The hand/glove watermark is divided into two parts by the central fold of the quire: a bold ‘W’ or ‘M’ denotes the sleeve/palm part of the watermark; normal type denotes the fingers and fleuron/crown. The watermarks in quires i-v are mixed in their orientation: seven sheets have thumbs above (W); and eight sheets thumbs below (M). That this variation was not the result of differences in how the sheets were folded is proven by the location of the tranche file lines, narrower chainlines that bordered the short, left- and right-hand edges of the paper mould.

In both quires i-v and vi-xvi, the distance between the chainlines varies slightly by a few millimetres: approximately 40mm in the former, 35mm in the latter. The chainline at the bottom of the leaf, however, is always positioned closer to the nearest chainline: approximately 19mm in the former, 21mm in the latter. That they appear consistently at the bottom of the leaves of Add. MS. 89074 proves that the same pattern of folding was followed throughout the formation of the quires of the manuscript.

How do we explain the uniform positioning of the tranche files *but* the varying orientation of the watermarks? It depends on whether the variations were introduced at the paper mill or at the stationer’s shop. If they occurred at the point of manufacture, the twin moulds used for the batch of paper in quires i-v must not in fact have been identical. Two explanations suggest themselves:

- i). The watermark sewn onto one mould was oriented as a left hand and the other as a right hand, *but* both were located in the same half of the mould.
- ii). The watermark sewn onto both moulds was either a left or a right hand, *but* each was located in the opposite half of the mould to the other.<sup>32</sup>

Either way, in one stock the thumb on the watermark points away from the nearest tranche file, while in the other it points towards it.

If the variations occurred at the point of sale, the stationer or the scribe may have mixed together the two closely similar paper stocks in quires i-v, perhaps in order to use up what remained of each stock, before moving onto a fresh stock with a different watermark for quires vi-xvi.<sup>33</sup>

In quires i-v, the fingers are joined together but the thumb is spaced apart; a star or fleuron is joined to the middle finger by a short vertical line; and a long sleeve is ornamented with a narrow band at the cuff and a wider band at the sleeve end.<sup>34</sup> Measurements taken at ff. 31-32 are: 87 x 5[28]7 mm. The closest comparable examples are Briquet, nos 11159 (used in Genoa in 1483) and 11154 (used in Palermo in 1482).<sup>35</sup> The papers on which these watermarks were found exhibit trimmed sizes of 420 x 290mm and 430 x 300 mm respectively, slightly smaller than the lightly trimmed dimensions of the *reçute* paper used in Add. MS. 89074. Since no watermarks from the non-identical twin mould occur at the centre of the quire, it is impossible to provide accurate measurements for those watermarks.

In quires vi-xvi, the fingers are likewise joined and the thumb separate; in place of a fleuron there is a crown; the sleeve is short and is ornamented by narrow bands at the wrist and sleeve end. Measurements taken at ff. 68-69, 104-105 and 140-141 were uniform: 82 x 5[23]7. Briquet no. 11323 (used in Palermo, 1479-84; a 'variété similaire' is found in use in Savoy in 1479) may be tentatively proposed as a match, displaying no apparent differences in proportion or design, with the paper being of similar overall size (untrimmed 430 x 300mm).

Quire xvi provides important evidence of how the quires of the second paper stock (and probably the first too) were assembled and how they were used by the scribe. In quire xvi, leaves 5 and 6 (ff. 187-188), 9 and 10 (ff. 190-191), and 11 and 12 (ff. 192-193) remain uncut, joined together by a fold at the top of the page. This provides incontrovertible evidence that the quire was made up using the 'quaternion method': each sheet of *reçute*-sized paper was folded once (bringing the two short edges together); then piled on top of one another with the fold at the top; and finally all three were folded together (in the same way) to form a quarto-format quire of twelve leaves.<sup>36</sup> Had the quires been assembled using the 'multi-folding' method – by piling three sheets and folding all three together twice – it would have been impossible for the

---

<sup>32</sup> There was no standard as to whether watermarks were located in the left- or right-hand halves of the mould. As Philip Gaskell observed of the format diagrams he reproduced on pp. 88-105, 'Watermarks are shown in particular halves of the sheets, but they could as easily be in the opposite halves.'

<sup>33</sup> Coleman, pp. 153-4. As Coleman observed of manuscripts of Boccaccio's *Il Teseida*, 'The variation of papers on the part of the stationer is methodical even in terms of the sequence of quires. In most MSS. with 'discrete' quires, there is no doubling back. In 9 of these 12 MSS., the quires are arranged in rigid sequence. Once a quire with a new type of paper is introduced, subsequent quires do not revert to previous paper types.'

<sup>34</sup> For the purposes of this paper, I will employ a modified version of the measurement conventions outlined by Tanselle. The first measurement gives the length of the watermark. The second gives its width at the widest point in square brackets, which are preceded by the distance between the thumb-side of the watermark and the nearest chainline and followed by the distance between the finger-side of the watermark and the nearest chainline.

<sup>35</sup> Briquet no. 11159: the hand appears too elongated in Briquet's tracing, the sleeve is a little too short and it lacks the banding at the wrist. Briquet no. 11154: the hand appears too elongated and the sleeve too short. Both examples are mounted on a supplementary chainline (or *tranche de fil*) which is not present in Add MS. 89074. Genoa may indeed be the place of origin for the *Catholicon*'s first paper stock: paper bearing the hand/glove motif was common in this area: C. M. Briquet, *Papiers et filigranes des archives de Gênes, 1154 à 1700* (Geneva, 1888).

<sup>36</sup> G. S. Ivy coined the term 'bifolium method' to describe this way of assembling folio-format quires; I have adopted the term 'quaternion method' as the equivalent for quarto-format quires. G. S. Ivy, 'The Bibliography of the Manuscript Book', in *The English Library Before 1700: Studies in Its History*, ed. by Francis Wormald and C. E. Wright (London, 1958), pp. 32-65 (p. 38).



first four leaves of quire xvi to have been cut open without simultaneously freeing all of the leaves of the quire. The survival of uncut folds after the end of the text on f. 185v indicates that the scribe cut the leaves as he wrote, not quire-by-quire but leaf-by-leaf. The sixth and seventh leaves are only uncut because at some point after the manuscript was bound the whole of the seventh leaf was removed.

### III

North Yorkshire has traditionally been proposed on linguistic evidence as the region in which this copy of the *Catholicon* was made. In the absence of any further evidence to the contrary, we must tentatively infer that the paper was sold, the quires assembled and the manuscript copied in this same location. However, new codicological evidence has come to light which indicates that the current binding at least was made elsewhere: not in Yorkshire, but south of the River Humber in Lincolnshire, most probably in Lincoln itself.

The background to the discovery of this evidence was the conservation assessment conducted by Ann Tomalak of the British Library Conservation Centre. Her report noted that the fragility of the binding necessitated very careful handling. The inflexibility of the spine leather strains the binding each time it is opened: tears extending from the spine are visible at the lower corners of the front and rear boards. For this reason, the manuscript cannot be safely opened at an angle of more than ninety degrees, and must be supported with foam wedges at all times. Any close consultation of its physical structure is consequently a challenge – especially the examination of the series of parchment stubs within the manuscript, hitherto unrecorded in print.

Probably during its possession by the Monson family, the manuscript had been paginated. In line with British Library policy, it was decided to foliate the manuscript, and to include the parchment stubs as part of the foliation. In March 2014, I produced a short report on the location of these stubs. I found that the sources of both the front and rear set of pastedowns and endleaves did not appear to have been used to supply the sewing guards. The front set contains extracts from John Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew (no. 39), Hugh of St Victor's *Expositio in Regulam S. Augustini* (ch. 10), pseudo-Eusebius's *Homiliae X ad monachos* (no. 3), among others; the text itself has not been identified. The rear set is taken from a glossed bible of the 13th century: f. 194 contains Joshua 16:10-18:9; the rear pastedown contains Joshua 21:4-21:19.

During the preliminary inspection, I recorded that thirty-two strips of parchment had been inserted during the stitching of the manuscript's sixteen paper quires: a strip around the back of each quire and another at its centre.<sup>37</sup> There is also an extra stub at the beginning of the manuscript (f. 1a) and another at the end (f. 193b); I am unsure if they are physically connected to one another. Such insertions are not uncommon in paper manuscripts; they functioned as sewing guards and reinforced the quires against damage caused by the friction of the binding threads as they moved when the book was opened and closed repeatedly. It was decided that each pair of stubs would be foliated with the number of the preceding leaf and the lower case letters 'a' and 'b'.

More than half of these stubs contain scraps of writing; fourteen pairs are entirely blank. It was not possible to open the manuscript at a greater angle to read this text without risking serious damage. My solution was to use a pair of Plexiglas finger-pointers borrowed from the Imaging Studio to hold the stubs in position while I transcribed the fragmentary text.<sup>38</sup> A summary of the findings is contained in the table below. Stubs with writing on both sides (quires iii, iv, v and ix) were most likely taken from books; the identification of a will as the source of stubs

---

<sup>37</sup> A single stub is present after f. 170 and is foliated as f. 170a. The second stub, which would have been f. 170b, has been almost wholly cut away. However its counterpart survives on the other side of this quire (15) and is foliated as f. 182a. That both the recto and verso of f. 182a are blank suggests that no fragmentary text has been lost with the removal of f. 170b.

<sup>38</sup> These are made in-house by members of the Conservation Centre, in particular for use in the Imaging Studio during digitization, to hold leaves in place in a way that is sensitive to the physical condition of the item being photographed, and which is as unobtrusive in the final image as possible. These finger-pointers have been featured on the British Library's Medieval Manuscripts blog in a post by Ann Tomalak, 8 January 2015: <http://britishlibrary.typepad.co.uk/digitisedmanuscripts/2015/01/point-the-finger.html> [accessed 30 June 2015].

in, for example, quires vi, vii and viii, supports the conclusion that stubs with writing on a single side derive from medieval documents. Several different hands were observed, with text from at least half a dozen sources: the earliest being an manuscript containing an unidentified text from the thirteenth century, and several originating from three or more fifteenth-century documents. Those stubs marked in grey contain writing that runs horizontally across the stubs; little more than a few letters of each line are visible, making identification of their source all but impossible. Where lines of text run vertically along the stubs, more information about the source of the stubs is retrievable. A transcription of the visible text is provided in the appendix below. It is upon these scraps that the following analysis concentrates.

<i>Sequence and pairing of parchment stubs in the Catholicon Anglicum (Add. MS. 89074)</i>				
Quire	Outside of quire		Centre of quire	
i	1b r-13a v	blank	7a r-7b v	blank
	1b v-13a r	blank	7a v-7b r	memorandum, s. xv
ii	13b r-25a v	blank	19a r-19b v	blank
	13b v-25a r	blank	19a v-19b r	blank
iii	25b r-37a v	fragments, s. xiv; 37a blank	31a r-31b v	fragments, s. xiv
	25b v-37a r	fragments, s. xiv; 37a blank	31a v-31b r	fragments, s. xiv
iv	37b r-49a v	fragments; 49a blank	43a r-43b v	blank
	37b v-49a r	fragments; 49a blank	43a v-43b r	blank
v	49b r-62a v	blank	55a r-55b v	55a blank; fragments, s. xii
	49b v-62a r	blank	55a v-55b r	55a blank; fragments, s. xii
vi	62b r-74a v	will, s. xv	68a r-68b v	blank
	62b v-74a r	blank	68a v-68b r	blank
vii	74b r-86a v	blank	80a r-80b v	blank
	74b v-86a r	will, s. xv	80a v-80b r	will, s. xv
viii	86b r-98a v	blank	92a r-92b v	blank
	86b v-98a r	will, s. xv	92a v-92b r	will, s. xv
ix	98b r-110a v	fragments, glosses; 110a blank	104a r-104b v	104a blank; fragments, glosses
	98b v-110a r	fragments, glosses; 110a blank	104a v-104b r	104a blank; fragments, glosses
x	110b r-122a v	charter, s. xv	116a r-116b v	blank
	110b v-122a r	blank	116a v-116b r	blank
xi	122b r-134a v	blank	128a r-128b v	blank
	122b v-134a r	blank	128a v-128b r	charter, s. xv
xii	134b r-146a v	134b blank; fragment	140a r-140b v	blank
	134b v-146a r	inventory, s. xv	140a v-140b r	charter, s. xv
xiii	146b r-158a v	blank	152a r-152b v	blank
	146b v-158a r	blank	152a v-152b r	charter, s. xv
xiv	158b r-170a v	blank	164a r-164b v	blank
	158b v-170a r	blank	164a v-164b r	blank
xv	<170b>-182a v	blank	176a r-176b v	blank
	<170b>-182a r	blank	176a v-176b r	blank
xvi	182b r-193a v	fragments, English	188a r-188b v	blank
	182b v-193a r	blank	188a v-188b r	blank

Four portions of text from four separate documents refer to two locations in Lincolnshire. The first document is a fifteenth-century memorandum (ff. 7a v-7b r), ordering the delivery of a ‘ffardell’ (a package or bundle of goods) to ‘Meister Burgh’ at Gainsborough. It must therefore have been written elsewhere and perhaps carried along with the goods as a form of consignment note. The charter surviving in three portions at ff. 128a v-128b r, 140a v-140b r and 152a v-152b r by contrast originated in Gainsborough. The text on the third portion records its completion by the application of ‘sigillo meo apud Gaynesburgh’ at some point during Edward IV’s reign (1461-70, 1471-83).

Portions of two fifteenth-century wills yield the second location: the village of Fillingham, located some eleven miles directly north of Lincoln. The fragment at ff. 80a v-80b r mentions Fillingham twice: the testator ordered his body to be buried in consecrated ground in the cemetery of the parish church of St Andrew the Apostle at Fillingham, and made a couple of bequests to the church of 4d each, one towards the fabric of the nave. The second will begins at ff. 74b v-86a r, with ‘In dei nomine Amen’, and the date of the 9th of the month. The testator’s name is tantalizingly hidden behind quire vii, but his humble occupation is known (‘<...>lyngham lincolniensis diocesi husbandman’). The text continues with a statement of his sound mind and his bequeathing of his soul to God and the Virgin Mary (‘In primis lego animam meam deo patri omnipotenti beate marie semper virgini’). The presence of the phrase ‘In primis’ on both sewing guards, at the beginning of clauses commending the testator’s soul and body, demonstrates that they originated from separate documents.

We cannot be certain of the book’s movements or where else it might have been carried. A fragment of an inventory at ff. 134b v-146a r contains a list of tracts (‘... Iuxta hunc [sic] textum et cetera ... tractatus de naturis ...’), and on the reverse side a fragment of text that reads ‘SOPHISTRIA OXONIENSIS’. Given Flower’s association with Lincoln College, it is not inconceivable that the book was bound in Oxford, though the presence of scraps of documents related to rural Lincolnshire in that location would be harder to explain.<sup>39</sup> Certainly, book craftsmen had been present in Lincoln since the mid-thirteenth century, gathered around Luminour Lane.<sup>40</sup> It may be that the materials for the *Catholicon* were sourced in Lincoln, paper specifically being available at least as early as 1359-1360: on Saturday 4 January, ‘Pierre de Belle-Assise’, a grocer of Lincoln, supplied quires of paper to the household of King John of France during his captivity.<sup>41</sup> Further investigation is needed before the attribution of Add. MS. 89074 to North Yorkshire can be challenged. There is nevertheless notable circumstantial evidence to place the book elsewhere by the late fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries: Thomas Flower’s position as sub-chanter at the cathedral, the proximity of Gainsborough and Fillingham, and evidence of an urban book-trade cumulatively suggest Lincoln as the location in which this copy of the *Catholicon Anglicum* was bound and maybe used.

<sup>39</sup> There is evidence (though of art-historical nature) to suggest longstanding book-trade connections between the two towns. For instance, the Salvin Hours (London, British Library, Add. MS. 48985): ‘From the evidence of this suffrage [to Robert Grosseteste], and the stylistic connection with the Huth Psalter whose text has strong Lincoln features, it has been suggested that both manuscripts were made for, or even at, that place. Although it is possible that artists deriving from Oxford workshops set up in Lincoln, it seems not unlikely that the Salvin Hours could have been made in Oxford itself, which was at the southernmost extremity of the diocese of Lincoln.’ See Nigel J. Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts, A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles*, 4, 2 vols (London, 1982), vol. ii, p. 151 (no. 158).

<sup>40</sup> A. I. Doyle, ‘The English Provincial Book Trade Before Printing’, in *Six Centuries of the Provincial Book Trade in Britain: Proceedings of the Eighth Seminar on the British Book Trade, Durham, July 1990*, ed. by Peter Isaac (Winchester, 1990), pp. 13–29 (p. 21); J. W. F. Hill, *Medieval Lincoln* (Cambridge, 1948), pp. 161, 363.

<sup>41</sup> *Comptes de l’Argenterie des Rois de France au XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, ed. by L. Douët-D’Arcq (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1851), p. 227. Pierre is noted as ‘espicier à Lincole’ in an entry in the accounts on Thursday 19 September the previous year (p. 217).

How does the *Catholicon* compare with other manuscripts of this genre? Of the eleven manuscripts at the British Library containing the *Medulla grammatica* or *Promptorium parvulorum* (or both), six were written on paper, five on parchment. Two of the paper manuscripts contain (or used to) parchment sewing guards; a third is a variation on this format, with the outer leaves of each paper quire being formed of parchment.<sup>42</sup> Two other paper manuscripts have had many of their leaves repaired and remounted; evidence of their binding has consequently been lost. Seven contain no other decoration besides plain red initials; two have gaps for initials; one has slightly more elaborate blue initials with red pen flourishing (Harley MS 2257). In two cases, contemporary or at least early binding survives: Add. MS. 33534 with wooden boards covered in brown leather with two straps (only partially surviving) and evidence on the rear cover of labels or bosses, now removed; and Add. MS. 62080 with wooden boards covered in pink-dyed leather with a single clasp (now gone).<sup>43</sup>

Their circulation also appears to have been predominantly regional, outside London and the university towns. Four of the individuals whose names were inscribed in Add. MS. 62080 during the 15th, 16th or 17th century are connected with Nottinghamshire (though were not necessarily the book's owner): Thomas Guyner/Gayner of Nottingham (15th century), Thomas Hutchinson of Papplewick and Thomas Stourleay/Stearley of Halam (both 16th century), nine miles north and fifteen miles north-west of the county town respectively, and Humphrey Bonner, lord mayor of Nottingham 1593/94, 1600/01, 1607/08. The name of Sir Thomas Spencer of Wormleighton, Warwickshire was also inscribed in the 16th century.<sup>44</sup> Add. MS. 37789 and Add. MS. 22556 have been assigned on linguistic grounds to Norfolk.<sup>45</sup>

The physical make-up, structure and probable places of copying and binding of Add. MS. 89074 are therefore entirely typical of manuscripts of this kind. Late medieval dictionaries appear to have been modest (though not cheap) and functional, witnesses to the need to learn or to teach the rudiments of composition in the language of scholarship, law, and administration. Demand for these copies at least seems to have originated outside the major centres of learning. Flower's connection with Oxford was longstanding by the time he acquired his copy of the *Catholicon*, but he chose instead to emphasize his status at Lincoln cathedral in his ownership inscription. There is a clear temptation to conclude that the book was consequently in all likelihood used and had been acquired at Lincoln. There is evidence that grammar was taught to cathedral choristers as early as 1308 and (at least at intervals) as late as 1524-26, and there had been a grammar school in the town on a permanent basis since 1236.<sup>46</sup> Although no records of such teaching survive for the year Flower purchased the *Catholicon*, an Oxford-educated cleric would have been the ideal candidate to undertake it (even one needing the assistance

---

<sup>42</sup> Add. MS. 62080, Harley MS. 2270 (nineteen parchment sewing guards, removed during rebinding in December 1966, are pasted onto the verso of the first endleaf at the end of the volume), Harley MS. 2257 (parchment bifolia forming the innermost and outermost leaves of each quire).

<sup>43</sup> Add. MS. 37789 used to be bound in 'old oak boards, rebacked', but has since been rebound; see *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years MDCCCXVI-MDCCCXX* (London, 1912), pp. 152-53.

<sup>44</sup> Add. MS. 62080, ff. 1v (Guyner/Gayner, Spencer, Hutchinson), 76r (Bonner), 128r and 143r (Stourleay/Stearley). Several of the individuals whose names were inscribed in this manuscript during the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries were not necessarily its owners: some names are inscribed by a common hand, while others are mentioned within the context of extracts/fragments from contemporary documents that have been scribbled in the margins.

<sup>45</sup> Richard Beadle, 'Prolegomena to a Literary Geography of Late Medieval Norfolk', in *Regionalism in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts: Essays Celebrating the Publication of 'A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English'*, ed. by Felicity Riddy, York Manuscripts Conference Proceedings, 2 (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 89-108 (p. 107); *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*, ed. by Angus McIntosh and others, 4 vols (Aberdeen, 1986), vol. i: *General Introduction, Index of Sources, Dot Maps*, p. 100.

<sup>46</sup> Nicholas Orme, *Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England* (New Haven, 2006), p. 359.

of a dictionary). As regards the question of acquisition in Lincoln, the book trade in such places is poorly documented; in many cases the surviving books represent the best evidence available. The study of them, and by extension the discipline of codicology, will benefit from the systematic gathering and comparative analysis of data about the materials. In the case of the newly acquired *Catholicon Anglicum* manuscript, close examination of the paper, quires and binding structure has made it possible to reveal the very stages and likely location in which the book was assembled.

## Appendix: Transcription of text visible on parchment sewing guards, Add. MS. 89074

### Stubs

*ff. 7a verso, 7b recto:*

Memorandum that this ffordell' be delyuert at Gaynesbur<..> | for Meister Burgh

*f. 62b recto:*

dictis cum Rectoria eiusdem ecclesie cum omnibus decimis fructibus et oblacionibus ac aliis pertinenciis et [con adita] <...> | Alicui sacerdoti honesto discretis et habili ad seruandum curam animarum pro vno anno integro a festo sancti Marci euangeliste proximo futuro<rum>

*f. 74a verso:*

<...>perit vterque eo<...> | <...> curaturus actores factores et ne<...>corum uicorum(?) <...>tores et nuncios speciales ordino et consti<...>

*f. 74b verso:*

At the lower edge: ascender of a littera notabilior 'T'.

In the middle: IHS with mark of abbreviation.

(This is the beginning of the will; the text continues at f. 86a recto).

*ff. 80a verso, 80b recto:*

testamentum meum i<n?> <...> In primis <...> (rest of line gone) | et omnibus sanctis corpusque meum sacre sepulture in cimiterio ecclesie parochialis sancti Andree Ap<ostoli> de ffyllyngham | (next line obscured by the sewing thread) | de fylyngham predictis – iiii d Item do et lego ad fabricam nauis ecclesie parochialis predictis – iiii d Item do <...> | <...> marioris filiabus meis duas <...> |

*f. 86a recto:*

In dei nomine Amen xi die mensis <...> (rest of line hidden underneath quire) | [-]lyngham lincolniensis diocesi husbandman . Compos mentis et sane memorie ego cum corpore <...> (rest of line hidden) | <...> in hunc modum . In primis lego animam meam deo patri omnipotenti beate marie semper virgini

*f. 86b verso:*

suam de facto fonte le nam (?) (rest of line hidden) | <...> (words mostly cut away up to here) do et lego executoribus meis vt ipsi inde disponant pro <...> (rest of line hidden)

*f. 92a verso, 92b recto:*

lego meum optimum animal nomine mortuarii Item do et lego catine (?) <...> (rest of line cut away) | (middle line obscured by thread, includes 'Willelmo filiis meis') | <...> Item do et lego Alicio <...> et Roberto filiis meis vn<..> <...>que eorum |

*f. 98a recto:*

eorum vnam <...> Item ei <...> fine mee et <...> et



*f. 110b recto:*

(?)*meum pluribus est incognitum sigillum venerabiliter viri (?)Officiis <...> dioc' | <...> Apposuimus (?)infra*

*f. 122a verso:*

(?)*Item eum vel eos et firmarium quicumque fuit faciendum et obligacionem seu obligaciones pro solucionibus recipiendum et (?)guara-<...> |*

*f. 128a verso:*

(?)*ac (?)omnibus <...> Consta<...> <...> | omnibus aliis Ministris domini Regis ibidem et eorem cuilibet salutem <...> Willelm<..> | populum domini Regis et precipue versus Robertum Wilk<..>*

*f. 134b verso:*

*Item tractatus qui vocatur Iuxta hunc (sic) textum et cetera // Item tractatus de naturis | Item tractatus de <->*

*f. 140a verso, 140b recto:*

*husbandman . Ideo Ex parte dicti domini Regis [?] et <obscured by thread> | <obsc> aliquis modo molestandum ipsum Willelmum quacumque*

*f. 146a recto:*

*M Item de materia probandi propositiones / Item <...>*

*ff. 146a verso, 146b recto:*

*SOPHISTRIA OXONIENSIS*

*ff. 152a verso, 152b recto:*

*<obscured by stitching and cut away> sigillo meo apud Gaynesburgh vi<..> | <...> Edwardi quarti post conquestum*